

### REMARKS

In the office action dated February 6, 2008, Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1-24 are rejected.

Claims 5-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 5-14 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chalk (U.S. Patent No. 6,850,611).

In response to the office action, Applicants have amended Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 20, 21 and 24; and canceled claims 7, 8, 22 and 23. No new matter is being introduced by way of the amendments.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5-16 and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement because of the use of the term “iteratively repeating” in the claim language and the fact that such term does not appear in the specification. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection. Paragraph 67 of the detailed description clearly describes one embodiment of the claimed repeated iterative process.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5-16 and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite because of the use of the phrase “accessing an NXX code.” The present amendment overcomes such rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,850,611 (“Chalk”). Chalk discloses a method of managing the rerouting of switches in response to receiving affirmative changes to a routing guide. Chalk does not disclose, teach, or suggest “identifying discrepancies between the code routing information received from the routing guide and the code routing information retrieved from switches in the telecommunication network.” as claimed in Claim 1 and Claim 17, and indeed Figures 17 and 18 were added to the disclosure of Chalk in the present application to accomplish such teaching. Instead, Chalk teaches an automated process for modifying the routing of switches when there are known changes to a routing guide. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 17 are

Application No. 10/669,928  
Amendment dated April 21, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2008

Docket No.: 2438  
(Prior Docket No.: 024777.0130PTUS)

allowable over Chalk. As Claims 2-4 and Claim 18 depend from Claims 1 and 17 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4 and 18 are also allowable.


Application No. 10/669,928  
Amendment dated April 21, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2008

Docket No.: 2438  
(Prior Docket No.: 024777.0130PTUS)

Applicants believe that no fee is due with this Amendment. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Dated: April 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Darren W. Collins  
Registration No.: 44,625  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
1717 Main Street, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(214) 259-0935  
(214) 259-0910 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicants